

ORIGINAL

**MCI WORLD COM**

1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20006

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

April 11, 2000

EX PARTE

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

APR 11 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Ms. Magalie Romas Salas  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

CC Docket No. 99-200

NSD File No. L-99-101 (PA); NSD File No. L-99-89 (UT); File No. NSD-L-99-102 (WA)<sup>1</sup>

Dear Ms. Salas:

On April 10, 2000, Hank Hultquist, Jim Joerger, and I of MCI WorldCom, Inc. and Dan Meldazis of Focal Communications Corporation (Focal) met with Yog Varma, Chuck Keller, Diane Harmon, Les Selzer, Cheryl Callahan, and Aaron Goldberger of the Common Carrier Bureau to discuss a recently completed feasibility trial concerning unassigned number porting (UNP) between MCI WorldCom and Focal.

We discussed how the porting of unassigned numbers can add to the better utilization of numbering resources and further the Commission's goal of improved number assignment efficiencies. We urged the Commission to grant authority to at least one state to conduct trials on the porting of unassigned numbers. We distributed the attached document at the meeting.

In accordance with section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.1206, an original and one copy of this memorandum are being filed with your office.

Sincerely,



Karen M. Johnson

Associate Counsel, Regulatory Affairs

---

<sup>1</sup> Petitions of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, the Utah Public Service Commission, and the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission for delegated authority to pursue number conservation measures in their states.

No. of Copies rec'd 041  
List ABCDE

cc: Yog Varma  
Chuck Keller  
Diane Harmon  
Les Selzer  
Cheryl Callahan  
Aaron Goldberger  
Jeannie Grimes

Meeting with FCC  
Common Carrier Bureau  
April 10, 2000

Unassigned Number Porting  
Trial Report

Focal Communications and MCI WorldCom

Dan Meldazis  
Focal  
312-895-8272  
dmeldazis@focal.com

Jim Joerger  
MCI WorldCom  
972-656-5084  
jim.joerger@wcom.com

# Two UNP Scenarios Tested

**Scenario One:** Specific customer requests to port unassigned numbers from one carrier to another

**Scenario Two:** Establishing carrier footprints with small quantities of numbers

Scenarios tested in three major cities with forty numbers

# What UNP Should and Should Not Do

- Moves spare numbers between carriers
- Benefits competition and conservation
- Use for specific customer requests
- Use to establish rate area footprint
- Limited scope - 25 numbers per request
- Not intended for inventory building

# Key Goals of Trial

- Demonstrate current LSR process can handle UNP
- Determine third party administrator is not needed
- Ensure LNP supports porting spare numbers
- Show that systems can reserve and donate numbers
- Determine if number needs to be activated
- Test specific UNP customer request scenario
- Test UNP carrier footprint scenario

# General Findings

- Determined LNP systems can support UNP ports
- If carrier can mark working numbers as ported out, it can mark numbers UNP-ported out
- Donor carrier needs to be unambiguous
- Carrier can support UNP if OSS supports pooled port-ins
- Pooling should enable widespread UNP

# LNP Inter Carrier Processes Support Customer Specific UNP Scenario

- Standard LSRs with annotated remarks is sufficient
- LSR can be FAX or e-mail transmission
- Firm Order Confirmation process unchanged
- No change to LIDB, CARE, DA/DL
- Receiving carrier processes 911 records as “new”



# LNP Inter Carrier Processes Support Footprint UNP Scenario

- Standard LSR with annotated remarks is sufficient
- LSR can be FAX or e-mail transmission
- No change to Firm Order Confirmation process
- No change to LIDB, CARE, DA/DL updates
- Receiving carrier processes 911 records as “new”
- No snap-back required as number stays in inventory

# Conclusions and Next Step

- UNP is feasible
- Interactions between provisioning groups successful
- Should set 25 TN limit per request
- Donor needs to be unambiguous
- No need to activate numbers before porting
- Do not need third party administrator
- All test calls completed without difficulty
- Next Step: Ad-hoc UNP meeting
  - Goal is to share information and seek ILEC trial